

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	D. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/080,719		02/22/2002	Guillaume Ribadeau-Dumas	2-1032-189	4387
466	7590	09/19/2005		EXAMINER	
YOUNG	& THOM	PSON	BECKER, DREW E		
	TH 23RD S	TREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2ND FLO		22222	ARI ONI	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLING	ron, va	22202	1761		

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/080,719	RIBADEAU-DUMAS, GUILLAUME					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Drew E. Becker	1761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status		,						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ju	Iv 2005.						
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
	Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits is					
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-5</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1, 3-5</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers								
9) 🗆 -	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•.	•					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
2) Notice 3) Inform Paper	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Offic PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/080,719

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The application does not appear to disclose the limitation "wherein the coating is amorphous and non-crystallized and avoids moisture regain over time". The passage cited on page 1 merely describes the prior art uncoated candy as being amorphous, it does not describe the coating of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/080,719

Art Unit: 1761

4. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mentink et al [Pat. No. 5,314,701] in view of Dogliotti [Pat. No. 4,105,801] and Cherukuri et al [Pat. No. 4,317,838].

Mentink et al teach a method of coating sugar-free, amorphous boiled sweets (column 1, line 7) by applying a mixture containing 8-95% erythritol, isomalt, or mannitol (column 4, line 66; column 5, line 10), maltitol (column 5, line 19), hydrogenated starch hydrolysates (column 4, line 64), polymers of low-calorie saccharides such as oligosaccharides (column 5, lines 19-40), very little hygroscopicity (column 6, line 1), and the prevention of crystallization (column 5, line 51). Mentink et al do not recite 10-40% fat, or magnesium silicate. Dogliotti et al teach a method of coating candy with a mixture of polyol and 0.5-15% fat (column 2, line 12). Cherukuri et al teach a method of coating candy with an anti-sticking compound such as talc, or magnesium trisilicate (column 3, line 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fat of Dogliotti et al into the invention of Mentink et al since both are directed to methods of coating candy, since Mentink et al already included the use of polyols (column 5, lines 10 & 19), and since Dogliotti et al teach that the fat prevents crystallization of the polyol (column 2, lines 6-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the talc, or magnesium trisilicate, of Cherukuri et al into the invention of Mentink et al, in view of Dogliotti, since all are directed to methods of coating candy, since a goal of Mentink et al was to create a candy with reduced sticking (column 2, line 39; column 6, line 15), and since the talc, or magnesium

Art Unit: 1761

trisilicate, of Cherukuri et al was a commonly used anti-sticking agent for candy (column 3, lines 34-37).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DELLE BELLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9-15-05